arXiv:1611.06272v2 [math.OA] 21 Dec 2016

Obstructions to lifting abelian subalgebras of corona algebras

Andrea Vaccaro

Abstract

We study some obstructions which arise when trying to lift commuting positive elements in a corona algebra to commuting positive elements in the multiplier algebra, focussing on those caused by the cardinality of the collection we want to lift. In particular, it is known that no obstacles show up when lifting a countable family of commuting projections, or of orthogonal positive elements, to a collection of commuting positive elements ([14], [10]). However we prove, for A primitive σ-unital non-unital C*-algebra, that there exists a set of $\aleph_1$ orthogonal positive elements (which can be chosen to be projections if A has real rank zero) in the corona algebra which cannot be lifted to a commutative set of positive elements in the multiplier algebra. This generalizes some similar results in [10] and [4] regarding projections in the Calkin algebra.

1. Introduction

Let A be a C*-algebra, denote by $M(A)$ its multiplier algebra, by $C(A)$ its corona algebra (namely $M(A)/A$), and by π the canonical projection from $M(A)$ to $C(A)$. Denote by A_{sa} and by A_+ respectively the set of self-adjoint and of positive elements of a C*-algebra A.

A *lifting* in $M(A)$ of a set $B = \{b_i : i \in I\} \subseteq C(A)$ is a set $\{a_i : i \in I\} \subseteq M(A)$ such that $\pi(a_i) = b_i$. The study of how and if certain properties of $B \subseteq C(A)$ could be preserved in a lifting, and similarly the analysis of the relations between $B \subseteq C(A)$ and its preimage $\pi^{-1}(B)$, has brought to a wide family of lifting results, mainly used as a mean to produce specific examples (or counterexamples) of *-algebras. A general approach to this topic can be found in [14]. The reader who is interested in some applications is referred for instance to the construction in [6] (and its refinement in [19]), where the authors produce an amenable C*-subalgebra, call it B, of a certain corona algebra, such that $\pi^{-1}(B)$ is an amenable nonseparable Banach algebra which is not isomorphic to a C*-algebra. Other interesting examples are in [1] and in [2]. The former paper presents, assuming the Continuum Hypothesis, a non-separable C*-algebra whose abelian subalgebras are separable, while in the latter Anderson produces a masa in the Calkin algebra generated by its projections which doesn't lift to a masa in $B(H)$. Anderson's proof requires the Continuum Hypothesis, and it is not known yet whether this assumption can be removed from the proof (see also [18]).

Let A be a non-commutative non-unital C*-algebra. In the present paper we study, given a commutative collection B in $C(A)$, the possible obstructions which might prevent a commutative lifting of B in $M(A)$. We will consider families with several different properties, but our main concern will be the role played by the cardinality of the set we want to lift. The following table summarizes all the cases we are going to analyze:

[0] *Keywords*: corona algebra, commutative self-adjoint elements, lifting.

$C(A) \to M(A)$	$< \aleph_0$	$\aleph_0$	$\aleph_1$
Commuting self-adjoint $\to$ Commuting self-adjoint	$\times$	$\times$	$\times$
Commuting projections $\to$ Commuting projections	✓ in $C(H)$	✓ in $C(H)$	$\times$
Commuting projections $\to$ Commuting positive	✓	✓	$\times$
Orthogonal positive $\to$ Orthogonal positive	✓	✓	$\times$
Orthogonal positive $\to$ Commuting positive	✓	✓	$\times$

Here "✓" and "×" indicate whether it is possible or not to have the lifting on the left column for collections whose size is the cardinal in the top line, and $C(H)$ is the Calkin algebra. The requests on the left column become weaker going down, and this mirrors the hypotheses we are going to add through the paper after we encounter a counterexample, but it is clear from the table that starting with an uncountable collection is a fatal obstruction. Most of the results about the two columns in the middle are already known ([14], [10]), while the main contribution of this paper regards the right column, for which some results about projections in the Calkin algebra have already been proved ([10], [4]).

The first lifting problem in the table is one of the most immediate question in this context: is it always possible to lift commuting self-adjoint elements in a corona algebra to commuting self-adjoint elements in the multiplier algebra? The first obstruction we encounter is a K-theoretic one. Assume A is $K(H)$, the algebra of compact operators on a separable Hilbert space H (so that $M(A) = B(H)$ and $C(A) = C(H)$). Then any essentially normal Fredholm operator whose index is not zero, such as the unilateral shift, projects in the Calkin algebra to a normal element whose real and imaginary part commute, but they cannot be lifted to commuting self-adjoint elements in $B(H)$ (more on this in [5] and [8]).

A possible way to bypass this obstruction is, as mentioned earlier, to strengthen the hypotheses on the collection we start with. In [10, Lemma 5.34] it is proved that any countable family of commuting projections in the Calkin algebra can be lifted to a family of commuting projections (the authors actually provide a lifting of simultaneously diagonalizable projections). On the same lines of this result, in Section 2 we show, proving a more general statement about liftings, that any countable collection of commuting projections in a corona algebra can be lifted to a commutative family of positive elements in the multiplier algebra[1].

Another possibility is to start with a family of pairwise orthogonal self-adjoint elements, where we say that two elements are *orthogonal* if their product is zero. If such family is countable, then there exists a commutative lifting. It is actually possible to prove a stronger statement. In Section 2 we report a result of [14] which shows that, given a set $\{s_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, the relations

$$0 \leq s_n \leq 1$$

$$s_i s_j = 0 \ \forall i \neq j$$

are, according to the terminology of [14], *liftable*. This is equivalent to say that for every surjective *-homomorphism $\varphi : A \to B$ between two C*-algebras, and every countable family $\{b_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of orthogonal elements in B_+, it is possible to find a collection of orthogonal elements $\{a_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ in A_+ such that $\varphi(a_n) = b_n$.

In general we can't expect to be able to generalize verbatim the above result for uncountable families of orthogonal positive elements. In fact, by a cardinality obstruction, a multiplier algebra which can be faithfully represented on a separable Hilbert space cannot contain an uncountable collection of orthogonal elements.

So the best we can hope is to lift an uncountable family of orthogonal positive elements in a corona algebra to a family of commuting positive elements in the multiplier algebra. However, even in this case, we encounter an obstruction of set-theoretic

[1]We remark that it is not always possible to lift projections in a corona algebra to projections in the multiplier algebra. This might happen when $C(A)$ has real rank zero but $M(A)$ hasn't, which is the case for instance for $A = C(H) \otimes K(H)$ (see [21, Example 2.7(iii)]) and $A = \mathcal{Z} \otimes K(H)$, where $\mathcal{Z}$ is the Jiang-Su algebra (see [12]).

nature. In Theorem 5.35 of [10] the authors produce an $\aleph_1$-sized set of orthogonal projections in the Calkin algebra which cannot be simultaneously lifted to diagonalizable projections in $B(H)$. This result is refined in Theorem 7 of [4], here the $\aleph_1$-sized set of orthogonal projections doesn't contain any uncountable subset that simultaneously lifts to commuting projections.

The main result of this paper is a generalization of Theorem 7 in [4].

Theorem 1.1. *Assume A is a σ-unital non-unital primitive C*-algebra. Then there is a collection of $\aleph_1$ pairwise orthogonal positive elements of $C(A)$ containing no uncountable subset that simultaneously lifts to commuting elements in $M(A)$.*

Corollary 1.2. *If moreover A has real rank zero, then the $\aleph_1$ positive elements in Theorem 1.1 can be chosen to be projections.*

The proof of Theorem 1.1 is inspired by the combinatorics used in [4] and [10], which goes back to Luzin and Hausdorff and the study of uncountable almost disjoint families of subsets of $\mathbb{N}$ and Luzin's families (see [15]). We remark that no extra set theoretic assumption (such as the Continuum Hypothesis) is required in our proof.

The paper is structured as follows: in Section 2 we report the results needed to settle the problem of liftings of countable families of commuting projections and of orthogonal positive elements. Section 3 is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.1, while concluding remarks and questions can be found in Section 4

2. Countable collections

In [10, Lemma 5.34] Farah and Wofsey prove that any countable set of commuting projections in the Calkin algebra can be lifted to a set of simultaneously diagonalizable projections in $B(H)$. The thesis in the following proposition is weaker, but it holds in a more general context.

Proposition 2.1. *Assume $\varphi : A \to B$ is a surjective *-homomorphism between two C*-algebras. Let $\{p_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subseteq B$ be a collection of commuting projections. Then there exists a set $\{q_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subseteq A_+$ of commuting elements (not necessarily projections) such that $\varphi(q_n) = p_n$.*

Proof. We can assume that A and B are unital and that $\varphi(1_A) = 1_B$. Let $C \subseteq B$ be the separable abelian algebra generated by $\{p_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and 1_B. As showed in [17, p. 293], if

$$b = \sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{2p_n - 1}{3^n}$$

then $b \in B_{sa}$ generates C. Denote by X the spectrum of b, so that $C \cong C(X)$, the last one being the algebra of continuous functions from X to $\mathbb{C}$. Pick $a \in A_{sa}$ such that $\varphi(a) = b$. If Y is the spectrum of a, we will have in general that $X \subseteq Y$. Fix $f_n \in C(X)_+$ such that $f_n(b) = p_n$, and let $F_n \in C(Y)_+$ be such that $F_n \restriction_X = f_n$. If we set $q_n = F_n(a)$ then

$$\varphi(q_n) = p_n$$

□

Observe that if in the previous proof we are able to lift b to an a whose spectrum is X (like in the Calkin algebra), then the q_n can be chosen to be projections.

We focus now on lifting sets of positive orthogonal elements, starting with a set of size two. Let therefore $\varphi : A \to B$ be a surjective *-homomorphism of C*-algebras, and let $b_1, b_2 \in B_+$ be such that $b_1 b_2 = 0$. Consider the self-adjoint $b = b_1 - b_2$ and let $a \in A_{sa}$ be such that $\varphi(a) = b$. Then the positive and negative part of a are two orthogonal positive elements such that $\varphi(a_+) = b_1$, $\varphi(a_-) = b_2$. The situation is not much different when dealing with countable collections, as shown in Lemma 10.1.12 in [14]. We report here the full proof.

Proposition 2.2. *Assume $\varphi : A \to B$ is a surjective *-homomorphism between two C*-algebras. Let $\{b_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a collection of orthogonal elements in B_+. Then there exists a set $\{a_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of orthogonal elements in A_+ such that $\varphi(a_n) = b_n$.*

Proof. Define for $j \in \mathbb{N}$

$$c_j = \sum_{i\geq j} 2^{-i} b_i$$

This is a collection of positive elements such that

- $b_i c_j = 0$ for $i < j$;
- $b_i \in C_j = \overline{c_j B c_j}$ for $i \geq j$.

Start lifting b_1 and c_2 to two orthogonal positive elements in A, call them a_1 and d_2 respectively. Let D_2 be the hereditary subalgebra generated by d_2 in A. Notice that a_1 is orthogonal to every element in D_2 and that $\pi(D_2) = C_2$. Consider now b_2 and c_3, which belong to C_2. Lift them to two orthogonal positive elements in D_2. Call these lifts a_2 and d_3 respectively. The elements a_1, a_2 and d_3 are orthogonal. Let D_3 be the hereditary subalgebra generated by d_3 in A and iterate this procedure. □

3. Uncountable collections

Throughout this section, let A be a σ-unital non-unital primitive C*-algebra. A C*-algebra is *σ-unital* if it admits a countable approximate unit, and it is *primitive* if it admits a faithful irreducible representation. We can thus assume that A is a non-commutative strongly dense C*-subalgebra of $B(H)$ for a certain Hilbert space H. In this case $M(A)$ can be identified with the idealizer

$$\{x \in B(H) : xA \subseteq A, Ax \subseteq A\}$$

or with the strict closure of A in $B(H)$. In particular, a sequence of operators $\{x_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is said to strictly converge to $x \in B(H)$ if and only if $x_n a \to xa$ and $ax_n \to ax$ in norm for all $a \in A$. Moreover, from now on denote by $(e_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ an approximate unit of A such that:

- $e_0 = 0$
- $e_i \neq e_j$ for $i \neq j$;
- $e_i e_j = e_i$ for every $i < j$.

Such an approximate unit exists since A is σ-unital, as proved in Section 2 of [16].

The proof of Theorem 1.1 follows closely the one given by Bice and Koszmider for Theorem 7, and a Lemma similar to Lemma 6 in [4] is required.

Lemma 3.1. *There exists a family $(a_\beta)_{\beta\in\aleph_1} \subseteq M(A)_+ \setminus A$ such that:*

1. *$\|a_\beta\| \leq 1$ for all $\beta \in \aleph_1$;*
2. *$a_\alpha a_\beta \in A$ for all distinct $\alpha, \beta \in \aleph_1$;*
3. *given $d_1, d_2 \in M(A)$, for all $\beta \in \aleph_1$, all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and all but finitely many $\alpha < \beta$:*

$$\|[(a_\alpha + d_1 e_n), (a_\beta + d_2 e_n)]\| \geq \frac{1}{8}$$

where $[a, b] = ab - ba$ is the commutator of a and b.

Once you have Lemma 3.1, the proof of Theorem 1.1 is almost identical to the one given in Theorem 7 of [4]. Nonetheless, for the sake of completeness, we report it here explicitly.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Let $(e_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subseteq A$ be the approximate unit defined above, and let $(a_\beta)_{\beta\in\aleph_1}$ be the $\aleph_1$-sized collection obtained from Lemma 3.1. Suppose there is an uncountable $U \subseteq \aleph_1$ and $(d_\beta)_{\beta\in U} \subseteq A$ such that

$$[(a_\alpha + d_\alpha), (a_\beta + d_\beta)] = 0$$

for all $\alpha, \beta \in U$. Without loss of generality, we can suppose $\|d_\beta\| \leq M \in \mathbb{N}$, and that there is a unique $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\|d_\beta - d_\beta e_n\| \leq \frac{1}{64(M+1)}$ for all $\beta \in U$ (just replace U with an uncountable subset if necessary).

Therefore, for any $\beta \in U$ and $\alpha < \beta$ in U we have

$$0 = \|[(a_\alpha + d_\alpha), (a_\beta + d_\beta)]\| \geq \|[(a_\alpha + d_\alpha e_n), (a_\beta + d_\beta e_n)]\| - \frac{1}{16} \geq \frac{1}{16}$$

This is a contradiction when $\{\alpha \in U : \alpha < \beta\}$ is infinite. □

We are left with proving Lemma 3.1. The idea is to build a sequence $(a_\beta)_{\beta\in\aleph_1}$ such that for each $\beta \in \aleph_1$:

$$a_\beta = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} (e_{f_\beta(2k+1)} - e_{f_\beta(2k)})^{\frac{1}{2}} c_k^\beta (e_{f_\beta(2k+1)} - e_{f_\beta(2k)})^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

(this serie belongs to $M(A)$ by Theorem 4.1 in [16]) where $f_\beta : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ is a strictly increasing function, and each $c_k^\beta \in A$ is positive and satisfies the inequality

$$\|[(a_\alpha + e_n), (c_k^\beta + e_n)]\| \geq \frac{1}{8}$$

for some $\alpha < \beta$ and some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The choice of f_β will guarantee orthogonality in $C(A)$ exploiting, for $n_2 < n_1 < m_2 < m_1$, the following fact:

$$(e_{m_1} - e_{m_2})(e_{n_1} - e_{n_2}) = 0$$

In the hypotheses we also required A to be primitive. The reason for this is that the main ingredient used to build c_k^β is Kadison's Transitivity Theorem (KTT from now on).

Proof of Lemma 3.1. We will assume $d_1 = d_2 = 1$, as the proof for the general case will easily follow. For each $n < m$ denote by $S_{n,m}$ the space $(e_m - e_n)H$. We start defining a_0. Let $f : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ be defined as follows:

$$f(n) = \begin{cases} 2^n & n = 2k+1 \\ 2^{n+1} - 1 & n = 2k \end{cases}$$

Since A is (algebraically) irreducible, and for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there is a non-zero vector x in the range of $e_{f(2k+1)} - e_{f(2k)}$, and $e_{f(2k+2)}(x) = x \neq 0$, we get that:

$$AS_{f(2k+1),f(2k)} = H$$

Thus, considering $A_k = \overline{(e_{f(2k+1)} - e_{f(2k)})A(e_{f(2k+1)} - e_{f(2k)})}$, which is an hereditary subalgebra of A, we can infer:

$$A_k H \supseteq S_{f(2k),f(2k+1)}$$

Consider $\xi_k^0, \eta_k^0 \in S_{f(2k),f(2k+1)}$ two orthogonal[2] norm one vectors. By hypothesis A has an irreducible representation in $B(H)$, thus the restriction of such representation

[2] We can always assume $S_{n,n+1}$ has at least 2 linearly independent vectors for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ by taking a subsequence $(e_{k_j})_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ from the original approximate unit.

to A_k is irreducible in $B(A_kH)$ (recall that in this case A_kH is closed). By KTT we can find a self-adjoint $c_k^0 \in A_k$ such that

$$c_k^0(\xi_k^0) = \xi_k^0$$

$$c_k^0(\eta_k^0) = 0$$

and $1 \leq \|c_k^0\| \leq 2$. We can suppose c_k^0 is positive by taking its square if necessary (the image of ξ_k^0 and η_k^0 doesn't change), note that in this case its norm lies between 1 and 4. Define

$$f_0(n) = \begin{cases} f(n)+1 & n = 2k+1 \\ f(n)-1 & n = 2k \end{cases}$$

We still get that f_0 is a strictly increasing function and that the length of the intervals $[f_0(2k+1), f_0(2k+2)]$ grows exponentially. Moreover

$$e_{f_0(2k+1)}c_k^0 = c_k^0 e_{f_0(2k+1)} = c_k^0$$

$$e_{f_0(2k)}c_k^0 = c_k^0 e_{f_0(2k)} = 0$$

which in particular gives

$$(e_{f_0(2k+1)} - e_{f_0(2k)})c_k^0 = c_k^0 = c_k^0(e_{f_0(2k+1)} - e_{f_0(2k)})$$

and, by functional calculus, also

$$c_k^0 = (e_{f_0(2k+1)} - e_{f_0(2k)})^{1/2} c_k^0 (e_{f_0(2k+1)} - e_{f_0(2k)})^{1/2}$$

We can thus infer by Theorem 4.1 in [16] that the sum

$$a_0 = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} c_k^0 = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} (e_{f_0(2k+1)} - e_{f_0(2k)})^{1/2} c_k^0 (e_{f_0(2k+1)} - e_{f_0(2k)})^{1/2}$$

is strictly convergent, so $a_0 \in M(A)$ and, being a serie of positive elements, it is positive. Moreover:

$$\begin{aligned} \|a_0\| &= \|\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} (e_{f_0(2k+1)} - e_{f_0(2k)})^{1/2} c_k^0 (e_{f_0(2k+1)} - e_{f_0(2k)})^{1/2}\| \leq \\ &\leq 4\|\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} e_{f_0(2k+1)} - e_{f_0(2k)}\| \leq 4 \end{aligned}$$

In order to show that $a_0 \notin A$, first observe that

$$a_0(\xi_k^0) = \sum_{m<k} c_m^0(\xi_k^0) + c_k^0(\xi_k^0) + \sum_{m>k} c_m^0(\xi_k^0) = c_k^0(\xi_k^0) = \xi_k^0$$

In fact the first sum annihilates because $\xi_k^0 = (e_{f_0(2k+1)} - e_{f_0(2k)})(\xi)$, and for $m < k$:

$$c_m^0(\xi_k^0) = c_m^0(e_{f_0(2k+1)} - e_{f_0(2k)})(\xi) = c_m^0 e_{f_0(2m+1)}(e_{f_0(2k+1)} - e_{f_0(2k)})(\xi) = 0$$

since $f_0(2m+1) < f_0(2k) < f_0(2k+1)$. The second serie annihilates because

$$c_m^0(\xi_k^0) = c_m^0(e_{f_0(2k+1)} - e_{f_0(2k)})(\xi)$$

and for $m > k$ $c_m^0 e_{f_0(2k+1)} = c_m^0 e_{f_0(2m)} e_{f_0(2k+1)} = 0$, and similarly for $e_{f_0(2k)}$. More in general, with the same reasoning, it can be proved that

$$a_0(\xi) = c_n^0(\xi)$$

for every $\xi \in \overline{S_{f_0(2n),f_0(2n+1)}}$. Observe that $\|(a_0 - e_{f_0(2m+1)}a_0)(\xi_k^0)\| = 1$ for $k > m$, thus $a_0 \notin A$.

Suppose now to have a family of elements $(a_n)_{n<\beta}$ ($\beta < \omega$ or $\beta = \omega$, ω being the first countable ordinal) in $M(A)_+$ and functions $(f_n)_{n<\beta}$ such that:

1. for all $n < \beta$ the function $f_n : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ is strictly increasing and, given any other $m < n$, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $j > N$ the following holds
$$|f_n(j) - f_m(i)| > 2^k$$
for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover we ask that for all $n \in \beta$ and all $k \in \mathbb{N}$:
$$f_n(2(k+1)) - f_n(2k+1) > 2^{2k+1}$$

2. for each $n < \beta$
$$a_n = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} c_k^n$$
where for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ $c_k^n \in A_+$ and $1 \leq \|c_k^n\| \leq 4$. We also require that:
$$e_{f_n(2k+1)} c_k^n = c_k^n e_{f_n(2k+1)} = c_k^n$$
$$e_{f_n(2k)} c_k^n = c_k^n e_{f_n(2k)} = 0$$
and that there exist $\xi_k^n, \eta_k^n \in S_{f_n(2k), f_n(2k+1)}$, two norm one orthogonal vectors, such that $c_k^n(\xi_k^n) = \xi_k^n$ and $c_k^n(\eta_k^n) = 0$.

3. given $n < \beta$, for all $l \in \mathbb{N}$, and for all but possibly l many $m < n$ the following holds:
$$\|(a_n + e_l)(a_m + e_l) - (a_m + e_l)(a_n + e_l)\| \geq \frac{1}{2}$$

It can be shown, as we already did for a_0, that for all $n \in \beta$:

- $a_n \in M(A)_+ \setminus A$ since
$$a_n = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} c_k^n = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} (e_{f_n(2k+1)} - e_{f_n(2k)})^{1/2} c_k^n (e_{f_n(2k+1)} - e_{f_n(2k)})^{1/2}$$
and for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ c_k^n is an element in A_+ of norm greater than 1;
- $\|a_n\| \leq 4$;
- for each $\xi \in \overline{S_{f_n(2k), f_n(2k+1)}}$ $a_n(\xi) = c_k^n(\xi)$.

Moreover, clause 1 plus the fact that for $n_2 < n_1 < m_2 < m_1$
$$(e_{m_1} - e_{m_2})(e_{n_1} - e_{n_2}) = 0$$
are sufficient to infer that $a_n a_m \in A$ for all $m, n < \beta$.

We want to build f_β and a_β such that the family $\{a_n\}_{n<\beta} \cup \{a_\beta\}$ satisfies the three inductive hypotheses. This will be sufficient to continue the induction and satisfy the thesis of the lemma. The construction proceeds inductively on the couples (i, j) with $i \leq j < \beta$. We start from $(0, 0)$, then we pass to $(0, 1), (1, 1), (0, 2), (1, 2)$ and so on. For each couple (i, j) we will provide a $c_{M_{i,j}}^\beta \in A_+$ such that
$$\|[(a_j + e_i), (c_{M_{i,j}}^\beta + e_i)]\| \geq \frac{1}{2}$$
and two values of f_β will be defined. Suppose we are at step (i, j) (let it be the $M_{i,j}^{\text{th}}$ step) and assume that $f_\beta(n)$ is defined for $n \leq 2M_{i,j} - 1$. Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ be the smallest natural number such that
$$f_j(2m) > \max\left\{i + 2, f_\beta(2M_{i,j} - 1) + 2^{2^{M_{i,j}} - 1} + 1\right\}$$
and such that for $l \geq 2m$ $|f_j(l) - f_k(n)| > 2^{M_{i,j}}$ holds for all $k < j$ and all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By inductive hypothesis there are two norm one orthogonal vectors $\xi_m^j, \eta_m^j \in S_{f_j(2m), f_j(2m+1)}$ such that $c_m^j(\xi_m^j) = \xi_m^j$ and $c_m^j(\eta_m^j) = 0$. Via KTT fix a self adjoint element
$$c_{M_{i,j}}^\beta \in \overline{(e_{f_j(2m+1)} - e_{f_j(2m)}) A (e_{f_j(2m+1)} - e_{f_j(2m)})}$$

such that

$$c^\beta_{M_{i,j}}(\xi^m_j+\eta^m_j)=\xi^m_j+\eta^m_j$$
$$c^\beta_{M_{i,j}}(\xi^m_j-\eta^m_j)=0$$

which means $\xi^\beta_{M_{i,j}}=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\xi^m_j+\eta^m_j)$ and $\eta^\beta_{M_{i,j}}=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\xi^m_j-\eta^m_j)$ (we can suppose $c^\beta_{M_{i,j}}$ positive and $1\leq\|c^\beta_{M_{i,j}}\|\leq 4$ by taking the square as we did for c^0_k). Let $f_\beta(2M_{i,j})=f_j(2m)-1$ and $f_\beta(2M_{i,j}+1)=f_j(2m+1)+1$, hence:

$$e_{f_\beta(2M_{i,j}+1)}c^\beta_{M_{i,j}}=c^\beta_{M_{i,j}}e_{f_\beta(2M_{i,j}+1)}=c^\beta_{M_{i,j}}$$
$$e_{f_\beta(2M_{i,j})}c^\beta_{M_{i,j}}=c^\beta_{M_{i,j}}e_{f_\beta(2M_{i,j})}=0$$

Moreover:

$$\|(a_j+e_i)(c^\beta_{M_{i,j}}+e_i)(\xi^\beta_{M_{i,j}})-(c^\beta_{M_{i,j}}+e_i)(a_j+e_i)(\xi^\beta_{M_{i,j}})\|=$$
$$\|a_jc^\beta_{M_{i,j}}(\xi^\beta_{M_{i,j}})-c^\beta_{M_{i,j}}a_j(\xi^\beta_{M_{i,j}})+a_je_i(\xi^\beta_{M_{i,j}})+e_ic^\beta_{M_{i,j}}(\xi^\beta_{M_{i,j}})-c^\beta_{M_{i,j}}e_i(\xi^\beta_{M_{i,j}})-e_ia_j(\xi^\beta_{M_{i,j}})\|=$$
$$\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}\|\xi^m_j-\eta^m_j\|=\frac{1}{2}$$

in fact, each of the last 4 pieces in the second line is zero, since $e_i(\xi)=0$ for every $\xi\in\overline{S_{f_j(2m),f_j(2m+1)}}$ (and the same is true if $d_i\neq 1$, for $i=1,2$). If $\beta=\omega$, then the construction goes on inductively and in the end we define

$$a_\beta=\sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}}c^\beta_n=\sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}}(e_{f_\beta(2n+1)}-e_{f_\beta(2n)})^{\frac{1}{2}}c^\beta_n(e_{f_\beta(2n+1)}-e_{f_\beta(2n)})^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

This serie is strictly convergent and the family $\{a_\alpha\}_{\alpha<\omega+1}$ realizes clauses 1 and 2 of the inductive hypothesis. On the other hand, if $\beta\in\mathbb{N}$, we have only a finite number of c^β_n, therefore their sum (which is finite) is going to be an element of A. What we do then is adding an infinite number of addends as we did for a_0. Say that $\beta=N$, then define $f_\beta(2(N+1))$ as the smallest integer such that

- $f_\beta(2(N+1))-f_\beta(2N+1)>2^{2N+1}$;
- $|f_\beta(2(N+1))-f_j(n)|>2^{2(N+1)}$ for all $j<\beta$; and for all $n\in\mathbb{N}$

Define $f_\beta(2(N+1)+1)=f_\beta(2(N+1))+3$ and continue inductively the definition of f_β. For each $n>N$ we can therefore, as we did for a_0 via KTT, find a positive element

$$c^\beta_n\in\overline{(e_{f_\beta(2n+1)-1}-e_{f_\beta(2n)+1})A(e_{f_\beta(2n+1)-1}-e_{f_\beta(2n)+1})}$$

which moves a norm one vector $\xi^\beta_n\in S_{f_\beta(2n),f_\beta(2n+1)}$ into itself, and another orthogonal norm one vector η^β_n to zero. It is easy to see that if we define a_β to be the sum of the c^β_n for $n\in\mathbb{N}$ so defined, the family $\{a_n\}_{n<\beta+1}$ satisfies clauses 1 and 2 of the inductive hypothesis.

We conclude verifying clause 3 for β. Remember that for $\xi\in\overline{S_{f_\alpha(2k),f_\alpha(2k+1)}}$ and for all $\alpha\in\beta+1$

$$a_\alpha(\xi)=c^\alpha_k(\xi)$$

Let $i\leq j<\beta$, and let $m\in\mathbb{N}$ be such that $f_\beta(2M_{i,j})=f_j(2m)-1$ (by construction we can find such m). Remember that $\xi^\beta_{M_{i,j}}=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\xi^m_j+\eta^m_j)\in S_{f_\beta(2M_{i,j}),f_\beta(2M_{i,j}+1)}$. We have that

$$\|(a_j+e_i)(a_\beta+e_i)(\xi^\beta_{M_{i,j}})-(a_\beta+e_i)(a_j+e_i)(\xi^\beta_{M_{i,j}})\|=$$
$$\|a_ja_\beta(\xi^\beta_{M_{i,j}})-a_\beta a_j(\xi^\beta_{M_{i,j}})+e_ia_\beta(\xi^\beta_{M_{i,j}})+a_je_i(\xi^\beta_{M_{i,j}})-a_\beta e_i(\xi^\beta_{M_{i,j}})-e_ia_j(\xi^\beta_{M_{i,j}})\|=$$
$$\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}\|\xi^m_j-\eta^m_j\|=\frac{1}{2}$$

This concludes the proof[3]. □

[3]In order to get the sequence of thesis just multiply every a_β by $\frac{1}{4}$.

Proof of Corollary 1.2. The proof follows verbatim the one given for Lemma 3.1 plus Theorem 1.1. The only difference is that, each time KTT is invoked in Lemma 3.1, it is possible to use a stronger version of KTT for C*-algebras of real rank zero (see for instance Theorem 6.5 of [3]) which allows to chose at each step a projection (remember that if A has real rank zero, then the same is true for all its hereditary subalgebras). □

4. Concluding remarks and questions

If A is a commutative non-unital C*-algebra, then the problem of lifting commuting elements from $C(A)$ to $M(A)$ is trivial, being the last two algebras abelian. In Section 3 we ruled out this possibility asking A to be primitive. The primitivity hypothesis can be thus justified as a strong negation of commutativity in this case.

If we assume A to be primitive, can we remove the hypothesis of σ-unitality and still get Theorem 1.1? There are some instances for which the answer is positive. One example is the algebra of compact operators over a non-separable Hilbert space H. In this case, let $L \subseteq H$ be a separable closed subspace, and let $\{a_\beta\}_{\beta\in\aleph_1} \subseteq B(L)_+$ be the sequence given by Lemma 3.1 for $A = K(L)$. Extend each a_β to be zero on $L^\perp$, think $\{a_\beta\}_{\beta\in\aleph_1}$ as a collection in $B(H)_+$, and consider a sequence $\{k_\beta\}_{\beta\in\aleph_1} \subseteq K(H)$. Let p be the orthogonal projection from H to L and denote by h_β the operator $pk_\beta p \in K(L)$. By Theorem 1.1 there exist α, $\beta \in \aleph_1$ and $\xi \in L$ such that

$$\|[(a_\alpha + h_\alpha), (a_\beta + h_\beta)](\xi)\| > 0$$

This implies that the element

$$[(a_\alpha + k_\alpha), (a_\beta + k_\beta)](\xi)$$

is the sum of a non-zero vector in L plus a vector in $L^\perp$, therefore it cannot be zero. The situation however is not clear in general. In fact, there are extreme examples of primitive non σ-unital algebras whose corona is isomorphic to the complex field $\mathbb{C}$ (see the algebra built in [11]), for which Theorem 1.1 is trivially false. Our hypothesis is that there might be a condition on the order structure of the approximate unit of A which is weaker than σ-unitality, but still makes Theorem 1.1 true.

We also want to remark that the proof we gave for Theorem 1.1 can be adapted to any primitive C*-algebra A which admits an increasing approximate unit $\{e_\alpha\}_{\alpha\in\kappa}$, κ being a regular cardinal, to produce a κ^+-sized family of orthogonal positive elements in $C(A)$ which cannot be lifted to a set of commuting positive elements in $M(A)$.

In conclusion, we want to present a problem related to the results of this paper. Assume $F \subseteq C(A)_{sa}$ is a commutative family such that any smaller (in the sense of cardinality) subset can be lifted to a set of commuting elements in $M(A)_{sa}$.

Question 4.1. Can F be lifted to a collection of commuting elements in $M(A)_{sa}$?

Theorem 1.1 and Proposition 2.2 show that this is not true in general for primitive σ-unital C*-algebras if $|F| = \aleph_1$, pointing out the set theoretic incompactness of $\aleph_1$ for this property. In the Calkin algebra, for every even number n we can find a family F of size n for which Question 4.1 has negative answer. Let S^n be the n-dimensional sphere. The algebra $C(S^n)$ is generated by $n+1$ self-adjoint elements $\{h_i\}_{0\leq i\leq n}$ such that

$$h_0^2 + \cdots + h_n^2 = 1$$

Let $F = \{h_i\}_{0\leq i\leq n}$. The relation above implies that the joint spectrum of a subset of F of size $m \leq n$ is the m-dimensional ball B^m. Since B^m is contractible the group $\mathrm{Ext}(B^m)$ is trivial (for the definition of the functor Ext and its basic properties see [5]), and this implies that, for any $[\tau] \in \mathrm{Ext}(S^n)$, any proper subset of $\tau(F)$ can be lifted to a set of commuting self-adjoint operators in $B(H)$. On the other hand $\mathrm{Ext}(S^{2k+1}) = \mathbb{Z}$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, thus a non-trivial extension τ of $K(H)$ by $C(S^{2k+1})$

produces a family $\tau(F)$ of size $2k+2$ for which Question 4.1 has negative answer [4]. This argument doesn't apply to families of odd cardinality, since $\mathrm{Ext}(S^{2k}) = \{0\}$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$. However, in [7] (see also [20], [13]), the author produces a family F of three commuting self-adjoint elements in the corona algebra of $\bigoplus_{n\in\mathbb{N}} M_n(\mathbb{C})$, such that every proper subset of F has a commutative lifting, but the whole family doesn't. It would be interesting to know the answer to Question 4.1 for countable families and for finite families whose cardinality is an odd number greater than 3.

Acknowledgements. My sincerest gratitude goes to Ilijas Farah, for its patience, and for the impressive amount of crucial suggestions he gave me while working on this problem and on the earlier drafts of this paper. I wish to thank Alessandro Vignati for stimulating conversations, for the knowledge he shared with me, and for the suggestions on the earlier drafts of this paper. Finally I wish to thank George Elliott for the incredible amount of interesting questions related to this topic he posed, for stimulating conversations, and for having suggested me a more intuitive way to present this problem and a more readable form of Lemma 3.1.

References

[1] Charles A. Akemann and John E. Doner, *A nonseparable C^*-algebra with only separable abelian C^*-subalgebras*, Bull. London Math. Soc. **11** (1979), no. 3, 279–284. MR 554393

[2] Joel Anderson, *Pathology in the Calkin algebra*, J. Operator Theory **2** (1979), no. 2, 159–167.

[3] Tristan Bice, *The projection calculus*, Münster J. Math. **6** (2013), no. 2, 557–581. MR 3148223

[4] Tristan Bice and Piotr Koszmider, *A note on the Akemann-Doner and Farah-Wofsey constructions*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1602.02429 (2016).

[5] Lawrence G Brown, Ronald George Douglas, and Peter A Fillmore, *Extensions of C*-algebras and K-homology*, Annals of Mathematics **105** (1977), no. 2, 265–324.

[6] Yemon Choi, Ilijas Farah, and Narutaka Ozawa, *A nonseparable amenable operator algebra which is not isomorphic to a* C**-algebra*, Forum Math. Sigma **2** (2014), e2, 12. MR 3177805

[7] Kenneth R. Davidson, *Almost commuting Hermitian matrices*, Math. Scand. **56** (1985), no. 2, 222–240. MR 813638

[8] ———, *Essentially normal operators*, A glimpse at Hilbert space operators, Oper. Theory Adv. Appl., vol. 207, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2010, pp. 209–222. MR 2743421

[9] Ilijas Farah, *Logic and operator algebras*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1404.4978 (2014).

[10] Ilijas Farah and Eric Wofsey, *Set theory and operator algebras*, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Series **406** (2012), 63–120.

[11] Saeed Ghasemi and Piotr Koszmider, *An extension of compact operators by compact operators with no nontrivial multipliers*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.04766 (2016).

[12] Huaxin Lin and Ping Wong Ng, *The corona algebra of the stabilized Jiang-Su algebra*, J. Funct. Anal. **270** (2016), no. 3, 1220–1267. MR 3438334

[4] If $\tau : C(S^{2k+1}) \to C(H)$ is a non-trivial extension then there is no *-homomorphism $\sigma : C(S^{2k+1}) \to B(H)$ such that $\tau = \sigma \circ \pi$. If we could lift $\{\tau(h_i)\}_{0\leq i\leq 2k+1}$ to commuting elements $\{s_i\}_{0\leq i\leq 2k+1}$ in $B(H)_{sa}$, they would generate a commutative C*-algebra $C(Y)$ which would contain some compact operators (otherwise $Y = S^{2k+1}$). Let τ' be such that $\tau \oplus \tau'$ is trivial and consider $\tau'' = \bigoplus_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \tau \oplus \tau'$. τ'' is trivial, hence $\tau \oplus \tau''$ is equivalent to τ. If we lift each $\tau \oplus \tau''(h_i)$ to the sequence with s_i in all the coordinates associated to τ and with zero in those associated to τ', we get a commutative lifting where the algebra generated doesn't contain compact operators, which is absurd.

[13] Terry A. Loring, *K-theory and asymptotically commuting matrices*, Canad. J. Math. **40** (1988), no. 1, 197–216. MR 928219

[14] ———, *Lifting solutions to perturbing problems in C^*-algebras*, Fields Institute Monographs, vol. 8, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1997. MR 1420863

[15] N. N. Luzin, *On subsets of the series of natural numbers*, Izvestiya Akad. Nauk SSSR. Ser. Mat. **11** (1947), 403–410. MR 0021576

[16] Gert Kjærgård Pedersen, *The corona construction*, Operator Theory: proceedings of the 1988 Gpots_wobash Conference, 1990.

[17] Charles E. Rickart, *General theory of Banach algebras*, The University Series in Higher Mathematics, D. van Nostrand Co., Inc., Princeton, N.J.-Toronto-London-New York, 1960. MR 0115101

[18] Saharon Shelah and Juris Steprans, *Masas in the Calkin algebra without the continuum hypothesis*, J. Appl. Anal **17** (2011), no. 1, 69–89.

[19] Alessandro Vignati, *An algebra whose subalgebras are characterized by density*, J. Symb. Log. **80** (2015), no. 3, 1066–1074. MR 3395360

[20] Dan Voiculescu, *Remarks on the singular extension in the C^*-algebra of the Heisenberg group*, J. Operator Theory **5** (1981), no. 2, 147–170. MR 617972

[21] Shuang Zhang, *Certain C^*-algebras with real rank zero and their corona and multiplier algebras. I*, Pacific J. Math. **155** (1992), no. 1, 169–197. MR 1174483

A. Vaccaro, Department of Mathematics, University of Pisa, Pisa, Italy 56127
E-mail address: vaccaro@student.dm.unipi.it